

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Advisory Action mailed November 14, 2006 rejected claims 1-22. This is a full and timely response to that outstanding Advisory Action.

I. Present Status of Patent Application

Claims 1 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1 and 13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1 and 13 of copending application number 10/602,987. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). To the extent that these rejections have not been rendered moot by the cancellation of claims, they are respectfully traversed.

II. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office Action rejects claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully submits that lines 19-28 on page 28 of provisional application 60/054,578 provides at least one embodiment of using a PID to select packets for encrypting. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection to claims 1 and 13 should be withdrawn.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

A. Claims 1-12

The Office Action rejects claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by *Wasilewski* (U.S. Patent No. 5,418,782). For at least the reason that the *Wasilewski* reference is an improper 102(b) reference, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The instant application claims priority to U.S. Patent No. 5,742,677 which was filed April 3, 1995. Since this predates the publication of the *Wasilewski* reference of May 23, 1995, the use of the *Wasilewski* reference is improper under 35 U.S.C. 102(b). Support for the claimed subject matter can be found in at least one embodiment in the '677 patent: "Any data leaving the secure microprocessor 205 may be likewise signed by the subscriber with a unique security object stored in secure memory and portions or all of the message encrypted with a subscriber may key..." See '677, col. 76, lines 61-64. Applicant also respectfully submits that the *Wasilewski* reference is also improper under 102(e) as it is not "by another." Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that use of the *Wasilewski* reference and rejections of claims 1-22 should be withdrawn.

IV. Miscellaneous Issues

Any other statements in the Office Action that are not explicitly addressed herein are not intended to be admitted. In addition, any and all findings of inherency are traversed as not having been shown to be necessarily present. Furthermore, any and all findings of well-known art and official notice, or statements interpreted similarly, should not be considered well known for the particular and specific reasons that the claimed combinations are too complex to support such conclusions and because the Office Action does not include specific findings predicated on sound technical and scientific reasoning to support such conclusions.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the now pending claims 1-22 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (770) 933-9500.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those which may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to deposit account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/BAB/
Benjamin A. Balser, Reg. No. 58,169

**THOMAS, KAYDEN,
HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, L.L.P.**
Suite 1750
100 Galleria Parkway N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(770) 933-9500
Customer No.: 38823